

FROM EUROPE BY STEAMER.

THE MEXICAN QUESTION.

Lord Stanley on England's Diplomatic Position in Mexico.

In the House of Commons, on the 11th of July, Sir L. Paik asked the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether it was his intention to take any steps to the opinion of the House of Commons on the murder of the Emperor Maximilian and his Generals.

Lord Stanley—Sir, it is not the intention of her Majesty's Government to ask the House to take any steps of the character proposed by the honorable gentleman. (Hear.) I am sure we all sympathize with his feelings, and every one, I think, will agree in lamenting the violent and untimely death of a gallant and amiable gentleman, whose high spirit and enterprise, under happy circumstances, might have rendered him distinguished either on the battle-fields or in the councils of Europe. (Hear, hear.)

But if we are asked to record a judgment of this House upon his execution, I confess I see very great objection to a step of this kind. (Cries of "Hear.") I do not see how we could come to any such resolution, or how we could discuss it without entering into a general debate upon the merits and policy of the Mexican expedition—upon the question of the Emperor's unfortunate death, and the right by which he claimed the possession of supreme power. (Hear, hear.)

All these circumstances would, I think, have a necessary and very material effect on our judgment. I do not think this would be the right moment to choose for a discussion of that kind (hear, hear), especially as it is one on which great difference of opinion might arise. (Hear.) Then again comes the question of precedent. We might, I think, if we accepted my honorable friend's suggestion, set a precedent which would be inconveniently on some future occasion. This is not the first case, and, unhappily, it is not likely to be the last, when the triumph of one party, after a protracted civil war, has followed by the execution of the Emperor, and a sanguinary act of revenge. Are we in all these cases to take notice of such acts in this House and pass a vote of censure upon them? If we are not to do so in regard to them all, on what principle are we to draw a distinction? But the question is not, whether we are to consider, and lastly, sir, I would say, though I say it with great respect, that, great as are our power and our influence, we are the Parliament of the United Kingdom, and not the Parliament of the Mexican Government.

responsible, directly or indirectly, for the lamentable event which has occurred; and I think it very doubtful whether a habit of international criticism in Parliamentary debate would be found practically useful, or conduce to a good understanding of the position of the country.

Mr. Otway wished to ask the noble lord whether her Majesty's Minister accredited to the late Emperor of Mexico is not at present in England, and whether, after the statement recently made by the Prime Minister, that the execution of the Emperor Maximilian was a base, cruel, and unnecessary murder, it is the intention of her Majesty's Government to advise her Majesty to accredit the minister to the President of the Mexican Republic, or to withdraw her accreditation from the Emperor.

Lord Stanley—It is true that her Majesty's Minister accredited to the late Emperor of Mexico is now in England on leave. His duty was discharged during his absence by the Secretary of Legation acting in charge of Affairs. But that gentleman was only accredited to the late Emperor, and with the death of that unfortunate Prince his credentials lapse. No question, therefore, has arisen, or can arise, as to his withdrawal. This gentleman had received, before his departure, the necessary instructions not formally or officially to recognize any new government which might be formed in the case of the downfall or overthrow of the Mexican Empire, but to confine himself, pending the absence of official notice, to looking after any matter which might arise affecting British interests. The question whether anybody should be accredited to the government of President Juarez is not, I think, one on which we are called to decide in haste, and the influence of time is only to be gained by not so hardly yet know what is the real state of Mexico, how far Juarez is really de facto master of the country, or what are the chances of his power being permanent. Upon that ground—setting aside all other considerations—there should be no objection to any precipitate suspension of diplomatic relations with Mexico. But as to the permanent suspension of those diplomatic relations, the objection to that course is, I think, a very obvious one. It would do no hurt, or only very little, to the Mexican Government, but it would believe the principal business of a British Minister in Mexico is to urge upon that Government various British claims, to which it is not, perhaps, very acceptable to them to listen. It would do no harm to the Government, but it would be a very serious thing for British interests, and for those British subjects who have claims upon them. (Hear, hear.) They are not responsible for the late deplorable proceedings, and I do not think it would be fair to punish them for them. (Cheers.)

The Franco-Mexican Bondholders. In the Legislative body of France, July 11. M. Boucher said, in reply to M. Pissard, that a semi-official communication relative to the position of the Mexican bondholders would be made to the Chamber by the Marquis de Moustier.

MEXICANIAN'S WILL. Curious Testamentary Arrangements of the Emperor and Empress. Vienna (July 10) Cor. of the Paris Liberator. I have already announced to you that the testamentary executor of the Emperor Maximilian was Count Franz von Zichy. It now turns out that there is a second Count Haddick. Concerning the will of the Emperor Maximilian and the Empress Charlotte some information of a precise nature has reached me, which cannot fail to excite the highest interest.

From what I learn, which of course I cannot guarantee, although I have it from the best source, two wills, perfectly analogous, were drawn up by the Emperor and Empress. Each of them, in case there was no issue of the marriage, leaves all the property to the survivor. Thus, Maximilian being dead, his fortune, estimated at from ten to twelve millions of florins, only calculating his property at Miramar, Lacroma, and the artistic wealth collected there, reverts to the Empress Charlotte. The will of Maximilian reverts to it.

But now comes the strange affair. It is asserted that the Empress Charlotte's will, written with her own hand, and which was carefully locked up in one of the rooms at Miramar, has suddenly disappeared, nobody knows where, or where, from the circumstance it results that, as the Empress Charlotte has no will and is not in a state to make one, seeing the almost complete absence of her mental faculties, all her fortune, including the part coming from her husband, the Emperor Maximilian, and which ought in justice, after her death, to revert to the Austrian Imperial family, will now legally fall to the royal one of Belgium.

THE PRACH CONGRESS. A Letter from Victor Hugo. Victor Hugo writes the following letter—apparently to Girardin:—"My Honorable and Dear Fellow Citizen:—I am nearly with you. A Peace Congress of the Nations will be a magnificent response to this Congress of Kings, which hatches war. I press your hand cordially. Victor Hugo. "Hauteville House, July 5."

THE PAPAL STATES. Another Papal Allocution. At the Consistory held Friday, July 12, the

Pope pronounced an allocution on the election of the new patriarch of Orléans, and also another allocution on the death of the Emperor Maximilian, ordering a funeral mass to be said for the repose of his soul in the Sixtine Chapel. The Pope then consecrated M. Bernadot, the Archbishop of Sens; M. Collet, Bishop of Grano; and M. Libichowski, auxiliary Archbishop of Poland.

ADDITIONAL FROM MEXICO.

Arrest of an Imperial Minister in the House of the British Consul—Juarez a Candidate for Re-election to the Presidency—The Shooting of Twelve Generals at Queretaro Confirmed—Another Revolution in Matamoros—The Government in Pursuit of Canales.

NEW ORLEANS, July 24.—The latest dates from the capital state that Marquez, O'Hara, and other prominent citizens were still at large. General Andrade Lacunza, Lopez, and others were found secreted in the English Minister's house, and arrested on the ground that foreign powers did not recognize the Liberal Government; therefore no consideration was due the Minister.

The northern army has left the capital for the interior. Corona recently passed through Queretaro with 7000 men en route for the Sierra de Anca to oppose Lozada. Garcia reports to Diaz that Merida has been taken by the Liberals.

Diaz recently obtained from eight commercial houses two hundred thousand dollars, without interest, to pay his army. Prominent army officers are offering their resignations every day, but none are accepted. A report is reported Felipe de Jesus Zerra Governor and Military Commander of the State of Tabasco.

While in Queretaro Juarez issued the order for the convocation of Congress and the election of a President of the Mexican Republic. He himself is a candidate. The election will take place immediately.

Otero, Castillo, and ten more generals, according to private accounts, were recently shot at Queretaro. The publication of the fact was prohibited by the authorities. Canales has proposed himself Governor of Tamaulipas, and levied contributions upon Victoria, San Fernando, and other places. He is supported by a small force. The people are much excited and call upon the Government for protection. Assistance has been promised, and the Spanish troops have left Queretaro to relieve the garrison at Matamoros.

THE NEW JERSEY CONVENTION.

Letter from Governor Ward—Retirement of the State Executive Committee.

During the Impartial Suffrage Convention held at Trenton on Tuesday, the following letter from Governor Ward was read:—

TRENTON, N. J., July 19, 1867.—Charles P. Smith, Esq., and others of the State Central Committee—Gentlemen:—I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your communication, which is to be assembled on the 23d inst., was duly received, and I am glad to hear that you intend to comply with your request. But in acknowledging your courteous invitation, I perhaps best fitting and proper that I should express my hearty approval of the purpose and object for which you have been convened. Connected with the Republican party from its first organization, accepting its traditional doctrines and its vital creed with all their natural and inherent consequences, I believe that the national and that its blessings and rights should accrue to all, without distinction of race, class, or color, and without the promise of any special franchise to be regarded as the inherent right of all who bear the burden and fight the battles of the Republic. I believe that the demand that we should confer upon a long prescribed and limited class of citizens the right to vote, to maintain and defend their rights. I have no question but that the policy which we regard as necessary for the preservation of our liberties, and for the good of the State, is to do right and act justly as duties which cannot be limited in their operation by any qualifications of race, color, or sex. I believe that the actions and actions may result in the accomplishment of the purpose for which you are convened. I believe that the fundamental law of our State and nation, I can only pledge my cordial cooperation to the work, and the confidence and support which I have received at the hands of the party you represent, and trusting that its success will continue to be yours, very truly, MARCUS L. WARD.

During the Convention the State Executive Committee sent in their resignation, which, after a debate, was accepted, and the President of the Convention was empowered to appoint a new State Executive Committee, to be composed of one member from each Congressional District and two from the State at large. The President announced that he would take his time, and not publish his appointments for a month or more.

Is News Public Property?

An English paper—the Derbyshire Courier—has the following:— "At the Belper County Court, Richard Allison was called upon to produce the copy of the 'Impeachment of Mr. W. B. W. under the following circumstances:—Some time ago plaintiff engaged with the proprietors of the Nottingham Daily Express to supply them with the reports of the Alfreton Petty Sessions and the district news. Defendant copied these reports into his paper; and plaintiff wrote a letter saying if this were continued he should expect an allowance of 10s. per week, and that he now demanded £2 for what had been already copied. Mr. Wombell took no notice of the communication; hence the action. Mr. Leech, solicitor, for plaintiff, on behalf of defendant, interrupted the plaintiff by telling his honor that it was the custom of the profession to copy each other's news; and even if it were not so, the report, after it had appeared in the Nottingham Daily Express, was now in the hands of the correspondent, but of the proprietor. He should prove the custom carried out by all newspapers in the kingdom by the evidence of the following gentlemen, whom he had subpoenaed:—Mr. Barton, editor of the Ilkeston Free Press; Mr. E. J. under the following circumstances:—Some time ago plaintiff engaged with the proprietors of the Nottingham Daily Express to supply them with the reports of the Alfreton Petty Sessions and the district news. Defendant copied these reports into his paper; and plaintiff wrote a letter saying if this were continued he should expect an allowance of 10s. per week, and that he now demanded £2 for what had been already copied. Mr. Wombell took no notice of the communication; hence the action. Mr. Leech, solicitor, for plaintiff, on behalf of defendant, interrupted the plaintiff by telling his honor that it was the custom of the profession to copy each other's news; and even if it were not so, the report, after it had appeared in the Nottingham Daily Express, was now in the hands of the correspondent, but of the proprietor. He should prove the custom carried out by all newspapers in the kingdom by the evidence of the following gentlemen, whom he had subpoenaed:—Mr. Barton, editor of the Ilkeston Free Press; Mr. E. J. under the following circumstances:—Some time ago plaintiff engaged with the proprietors of the Nottingham Daily Express to supply them with the reports of the Alfreton Petty Sessions and the district news. Defendant copied these reports into his paper; and plaintiff wrote a letter saying if this were continued he should expect an allowance of 10s. per week, and that he now demanded £2 for what had been already copied. Mr. Wombell took no notice of the communication; hence the action. Mr. Leech, solicitor, for plaintiff, on behalf of defendant, interrupted the plaintiff by telling his honor that it was the custom of the profession to copy each other's news; and even if it were not so, the report, after it had appeared in the Nottingham Daily Express, was now in the hands of the correspondent, but of the proprietor. He should prove the custom carried out by all newspapers in the kingdom by the evidence of the following gentlemen, whom he had subpoenaed:—Mr. Barton, editor of the Ilkeston Free Press; Mr. E. J. under the following circumstances:—Some time ago plaintiff engaged with the proprietors of the Nottingham Daily Express to supply them with the reports of the Alfreton Petty Sessions and the district news. Defendant copied these reports into his paper; and plaintiff wrote a letter saying if this were continued he should expect an allowance of 10s. per week, and that he now demanded £2 for what had been already copied. Mr. Wombell took no notice of the communication; hence the action. Mr. Leech, solicitor, for plaintiff, on behalf of defendant, interrupted the plaintiff by telling his honor that it was the custom of the profession to copy each other's news; and even if it were not so, the report, after it had appeared in the Nottingham Daily Express, was now in the hands of the correspondent, but of the proprietor. He should prove the custom carried out by all newspapers in the kingdom by the evidence of the following gentlemen, whom he had subpoenaed:—Mr. Barton, editor of the Ilkeston Free Press; Mr. E. J. under the following circumstances:—Some time ago plaintiff engaged with the proprietors of the Nottingham Daily Express to supply them with the reports of the Alfreton Petty Sessions and the district news. Defendant copied these reports into his paper; and plaintiff wrote a letter saying if this were continued he should expect an allowance of 10s. per week, and that he now demanded £2 for what had been already copied. Mr. Wombell took no notice of the communication; hence the action. Mr. Leech, solicitor, for plaintiff, on behalf of defendant, interrupted the plaintiff by telling his honor that it was the custom of the profession to copy each other's news; and even if it were not so, the report, after it had appeared in the Nottingham Daily Express, was now in the hands of the correspondent, but of the proprietor. He should prove the custom carried out by all newspapers in the kingdom by the evidence of the following gentlemen, whom he had subpoenaed:—Mr. Barton, editor of the Ilkeston Free Press; Mr. E. J. under the following circumstances:—Some time ago plaintiff engaged with the proprietors of the Nottingham Daily Express to supply them with the reports of the Alfreton Petty Sessions and the district news. Defendant copied these reports into his paper; and plaintiff wrote a letter saying if this were continued he should expect an allowance of 10s. per week, and that he now demanded £2 for what had been already copied. Mr. Wombell took no notice of the communication; hence the action. Mr. Leech, solicitor, for plaintiff, on behalf of defendant, interrupted the plaintiff by telling his honor that it was the custom of the profession to copy each other's news; and even if it were not so, the report, after it had appeared in the Nottingham Daily Express, was now in the hands of the correspondent, but of the proprietor. He should prove the custom carried out by all newspapers in the kingdom by the evidence of the following gentlemen, whom he had subpoenaed:—Mr. Barton, editor of the Ilkeston Free Press; Mr. E. J. under the following circumstances:—Some time ago plaintiff engaged with the proprietors of the Nottingham Daily Express to supply them with the reports of the Alfreton Petty Sessions and the district news. Defendant copied these reports into his paper; and plaintiff wrote a letter saying if this were continued he should expect an allowance of 10s. per week, and that he now demanded £2 for what had been already copied. Mr. Wombell took no notice of the communication; hence the action. Mr. Leech, solicitor, for plaintiff, on behalf of defendant, interrupted the plaintiff by telling his honor that it was the custom of the profession to copy each other's news; and even if it were not so, the report, after it had appeared in the Nottingham Daily Express, was now in the hands of the correspondent, but of the proprietor. He should prove the custom carried out by all newspapers in the kingdom by the evidence of the following gentlemen, whom he had subpoenaed:—Mr. Barton, editor of the Ilkeston Free Press; Mr. E. J. under the following circumstances:—Some time ago plaintiff engaged with the proprietors of the Nottingham Daily Express to supply them with the reports of the Alfreton Petty Sessions and the district news. Defendant copied these reports into his paper; and plaintiff wrote a letter saying if this were continued he should expect an allowance of 10s. per week, and that he now demanded £2 for what had been already copied. Mr. Wombell took no notice of the communication; hence the action. Mr. Leech, solicitor, for plaintiff, on behalf of defendant, interrupted the plaintiff by telling his honor that it was the custom of the profession to copy each other's news; and even if it were not so, the report, after it had appeared in the Nottingham Daily Express, was now in the hands of the correspondent, but of the proprietor. He should prove the custom carried out by all newspapers in the kingdom by the evidence of the following gentlemen, whom he had subpoenaed:—Mr. Barton, editor of the Ilkeston Free Press; Mr. E. J. under the following circumstances:—Some time ago plaintiff engaged with the proprietors of the Nottingham Daily Express to supply them with the reports of the Alfreton Petty Sessions and the district news. Defendant copied these reports into his paper; and plaintiff wrote a letter saying if this were continued he should expect an allowance of 10s. per week, and that he now demanded £2 for what had been already copied. Mr. Wombell took no notice of the communication; hence the action. Mr. Leech, solicitor, for plaintiff, on behalf of defendant, interrupted the plaintiff by telling his honor that it was the custom of the profession to copy each other's news; and even if it were not so, the report, after it had appeared in the Nottingham Daily Express, was now in the hands of the correspondent, but of the proprietor. He should prove the custom carried out by all newspapers in the kingdom by the evidence of the following gentlemen, whom he had subpoenaed:—Mr. Barton, editor of the Ilkeston Free Press; Mr. E. J. under the following circumstances:—Some time ago plaintiff engaged with the proprietors of the Nottingham Daily Express to supply them with the reports of the Alfreton Petty Sessions and the district news. Defendant copied these reports into his paper; and plaintiff wrote a letter saying if this were continued he should expect an allowance of 10s. per week, and that he now demanded £2 for what had been already copied. Mr. Wombell took no notice of the communication; hence the action. Mr. Leech, solicitor, for plaintiff, on behalf of defendant, interrupted the plaintiff by telling his honor that it was the custom of the profession to copy each other's news; and even if it were not so, the report, after it had appeared in the Nottingham Daily Express, was now in the hands of the correspondent, but of the proprietor. He should prove the custom carried out by all newspapers in the kingdom by the evidence of the following gentlemen, whom he had subpoenaed:—Mr. Barton, editor of the Ilkeston Free Press; Mr. E. J. under the following circumstances:—Some time ago plaintiff engaged with the proprietors of the Nottingham Daily Express to supply them with the reports of the Alfreton Petty Sessions and the district news. Defendant copied these reports into his paper; and plaintiff wrote a letter saying if this were continued he should expect an allowance of 10s. per week, and that he now demanded £2 for what had been already copied. Mr. Wombell took no notice of the communication; hence the action. Mr. Leech, solicitor, for plaintiff, on behalf of defendant, interrupted the plaintiff by telling his honor that it was the custom of the profession to copy each other's news; and even if it were not so, the report, after it had appeared in the Nottingham Daily Express, was now in the hands of the correspondent, but of the proprietor. He should prove the custom carried out by all newspapers in the kingdom by the evidence of the following gentlemen, whom he had subpoenaed:—Mr. Barton, editor of the Ilkeston Free Press; Mr. E. J. under the following circumstances:—Some time ago plaintiff engaged with the proprietors of the Nottingham Daily Express to supply them with the reports of the Alfreton Petty Sessions and the district news. Defendant copied these reports into his paper; and plaintiff wrote a letter saying if this were continued he should expect an allowance of 10s. per week, and that he now demanded £2 for what had been already copied. Mr. Wombell took no notice of the communication; hence the action. Mr. Leech, solicitor, for plaintiff, on behalf of defendant, interrupted the plaintiff by telling his honor that it was the custom of the profession to copy each other's news; and even if it were not so, the report, after it had appeared in the Nottingham Daily Express, was now in the hands of the correspondent, but of the proprietor. He should prove the custom carried out by all newspapers in the kingdom by the evidence of the following gentlemen, whom he had subpoenaed:—Mr. Barton, editor of the Ilkeston Free Press; Mr. E. J. under the following circumstances:—Some time ago plaintiff engaged with the proprietors of the Nottingham Daily Express to supply them with the reports of the Alfreton Petty Sessions and the district news. Defendant copied these reports into his paper; and plaintiff wrote a letter saying if this were continued he should expect an allowance of 10s. per week, and that he now demanded £2 for what had been already copied. Mr. Wombell took no notice of the communication; hence the action. Mr. Leech, solicitor, for plaintiff, on behalf of defendant, interrupted the plaintiff by telling his honor that it was the custom of the profession to copy each other's news; and even if it were not so, the report, after it had appeared in the Nottingham Daily Express, was now in the hands of the correspondent, but of the proprietor. He should prove the custom carried out by all newspapers in the kingdom by the evidence of the following gentlemen, whom he had subpoenaed:—Mr. Barton, editor of the Ilkeston Free Press; Mr. E. J. under the following circumstances:—Some time ago plaintiff engaged with the proprietors of the Nottingham Daily Express to supply them with the reports of the Alfreton Petty Sessions and the district news. Defendant copied these reports into his paper; and plaintiff wrote a letter saying if this were continued he should expect an allowance of 10s. per week, and that he now demanded £2 for what had been already copied. Mr. Wombell took no notice of the communication; hence the action. Mr. Leech, solicitor, for plaintiff, on behalf of defendant, interrupted the plaintiff by telling his honor that it was the custom of the profession to copy each other's news; and even if it were not so, the report, after it had appeared in the Nottingham Daily Express, was now in the hands of the correspondent, but of the proprietor. He should prove the custom carried out by all newspapers in the kingdom by the evidence of the following gentlemen, whom he had subpoenaed:—Mr. Barton, editor of the Ilkeston Free Press; Mr. E. J. under the following circumstances:—Some time ago plaintiff engaged with the proprietors of the Nottingham Daily Express to supply them with the reports of the Alfreton Petty Sessions and the district news. Defendant copied these reports into his paper; and plaintiff wrote a letter saying if this were continued he should expect an allowance of 10s. per week, and that he now demanded £2 for what had been already copied. Mr. Wombell took no notice of the communication; hence the action. Mr. Leech, solicitor, for plaintiff, on behalf of defendant, interrupted the plaintiff by telling his honor that it was the custom of the profession to copy each other's news; and even if it were not so, the report, after it had appeared in the Nottingham Daily Express, was now in the hands of the correspondent, but of the proprietor. He should prove the custom carried out by all newspapers in the kingdom by the evidence of the following gentlemen, whom he had subpoenaed:—Mr. Barton, editor of the Ilkeston Free Press; Mr. E. J. under the following circumstances:—Some time ago plaintiff engaged with the proprietors of the Nottingham Daily Express to supply them with the reports of the Alfreton Petty Sessions and the district news. Defendant copied these reports into his paper; and plaintiff wrote a letter saying if this were continued he should expect an allowance of 10s. per week, and that he now demanded £2 for what had been already copied. Mr. Wombell took no notice of the communication; hence the action. Mr. Leech, solicitor, for plaintiff, on behalf of defendant, interrupted the plaintiff by telling his honor that it was the custom of the profession to copy each other's news; and even if it were not so, the report, after it had appeared in the Nottingham Daily Express, was now in the hands of the correspondent, but of the proprietor. He should prove the custom carried out by all newspapers in the kingdom by the evidence of the following gentlemen, whom he had subpoenaed:—Mr. Barton, editor of the Ilkeston Free Press; Mr. E. J. under the following circumstances:—Some time ago plaintiff engaged with the proprietors of the Nottingham Daily Express to supply them with the reports of the Alfreton Petty Sessions and the district news. Defendant copied these reports into his paper; and plaintiff wrote a letter saying if this were continued he should expect an allowance of 10s. per week, and that he now demanded £2 for what had been already copied. Mr. Wombell took no notice of the communication; hence the action. Mr. Leech, solicitor, for plaintiff, on behalf of defendant, interrupted the plaintiff by telling his honor that it was the custom of the profession to copy each other's news; and even if it were not so, the report, after it had appeared in the Nottingham Daily Express, was now in the hands of the correspondent, but of the proprietor. He should prove the custom carried out by all newspapers in the kingdom by the evidence of the following gentlemen, whom he had subpoenaed:—Mr. Barton, editor of the Ilkeston Free Press; Mr. E. J. under the following circumstances:—Some time ago plaintiff engaged with the proprietors of the Nottingham Daily Express to supply them with the reports of the Alfreton Petty Sessions and the district news. Defendant copied these reports into his paper; and plaintiff wrote a letter saying if this were continued he should expect an allowance of 10s. per week, and that he now demanded £2 for what had been already copied. Mr. Wombell took no notice of the communication; hence the action. Mr. Leech, solicitor, for plaintiff, on behalf of defendant, interrupted the plaintiff by telling his honor that it was the custom of the profession to copy each other's news; and even if it were not so, the report, after it had appeared in the Nottingham Daily Express, was now in the hands of the correspondent, but of the proprietor. He should prove the custom carried out by all newspapers in the kingdom by the evidence of the following gentlemen, whom he had subpoenaed:—Mr. Barton, editor of the Ilkeston Free Press; Mr. E. J. under the following circumstances:—Some time ago plaintiff engaged with the proprietors of the Nottingham Daily Express to supply them with the reports of the Alfreton Petty Sessions and the district news. Defendant copied these reports into his paper; and plaintiff wrote a letter saying if this were continued he should expect an allowance of 10s. per week, and that he now demanded £2 for what had been already copied. Mr. Wombell took no notice of the communication; hence the action. Mr. Leech, solicitor, for plaintiff, on behalf of defendant, interrupted the plaintiff by telling his honor that it was the custom of the profession to copy each other's news; and even if it were not so, the report, after it had appeared in the Nottingham Daily Express, was now in the hands of the correspondent, but of the proprietor. He should prove the custom carried out by all newspapers in the kingdom by the evidence of the following gentlemen, whom he had subpoenaed:—Mr. Barton, editor of the Ilkeston Free Press; Mr. E. J. under the following circumstances:—Some time ago plaintiff engaged with the proprietors of the Nottingham Daily Express to supply them with the reports of the Alfreton Petty Sessions and the district news. Defendant copied these reports into his paper; and plaintiff wrote a letter saying if this were continued he should expect an allowance of 10s. per week, and that he now demanded £2 for what had been already copied. Mr. Wombell took no notice of the communication; hence the action. Mr. Leech, solicitor, for plaintiff, on behalf of defendant, interrupted the plaintiff by telling his honor that it was the custom of the profession to copy each other's news; and even if it were not so, the report, after it had appeared in the Nottingham Daily Express, was now in the hands of the correspondent, but of the proprietor. He should prove the custom carried out by all newspapers in the kingdom by the evidence of the following gentlemen, whom he had subpoenaed:—Mr. Barton, editor of the Ilkeston Free Press; Mr. E. J. under the following circumstances:—Some time ago plaintiff engaged with the proprietors of the Nottingham Daily Express to supply them with the reports of the Alfreton Petty Sessions and the district news. Defendant copied these reports into his paper; and plaintiff wrote a letter saying if this were continued he should expect an allowance of 10s. per week, and that he now demanded £2 for what had been already copied. Mr. Wombell took no notice of the communication; hence the action. Mr. Leech, solicitor, for plaintiff, on behalf of defendant, interrupted the plaintiff by telling his honor that it was the custom of the profession to copy each other's news; and even if it were not so, the report, after it had appeared in the Nottingham Daily Express, was now in the hands of the correspondent, but of the proprietor. He should prove the custom carried out by all newspapers in the kingdom by the evidence of the following gentlemen, whom he had subpoenaed:—Mr. Barton, editor of the Ilkeston Free Press; Mr. E. J. under the following circumstances:—Some time ago plaintiff engaged with the proprietors of the Nottingham Daily Express to supply them with the reports of the Alfreton Petty Sessions and the district news. Defendant copied these reports into his paper; and plaintiff wrote a letter saying if this were continued he should expect an allowance of 10s. per week, and that he now demanded £2 for what had been already copied. Mr. Wombell took no notice of the communication; hence the action. Mr. Leech, solicitor, for plaintiff, on behalf of defendant, interrupted the plaintiff by telling his honor that it was the custom of the profession to copy each other's news; and even if it were not so, the report, after it had appeared in the Nottingham Daily Express, was now in the hands of the correspondent, but of the proprietor. He should prove the custom carried out by all newspapers in the kingdom by the evidence of the following gentlemen, whom he had subpoenaed:—Mr. Barton, editor of the Ilkeston Free Press; Mr. E. J. under the following circumstances:—Some time ago plaintiff engaged with the proprietors of the Nottingham Daily Express to supply them with the reports of the Alfreton Petty Sessions and the district news. Defendant copied these reports into his paper; and plaintiff wrote a letter saying if this were continued he should expect an allowance of 10s. per week, and that he now demanded £2 for what had been already copied. Mr. Wombell took no notice of the communication; hence the action. Mr. Leech, solicitor, for plaintiff, on behalf of defendant, interrupted the plaintiff by telling his honor that it was the custom of the profession to copy each other's news; and even if it were not so, the report, after it had appeared in the Nottingham Daily Express, was now in the hands of the correspondent, but of the proprietor. He should prove the custom carried out by all newspapers in the kingdom by the evidence of the following gentlemen, whom he had subpoenaed:—Mr. Barton, editor of the Ilkeston Free Press; Mr. E. J. under the following circumstances:—Some time ago plaintiff engaged with the proprietors of the Nottingham Daily Express to supply them with the reports of the Alfreton Petty Sessions and the district news. Defendant copied these reports into his paper; and plaintiff wrote a letter saying if this were continued he should expect an allowance of 10s. per week, and that he now demanded £2 for what had been already copied. Mr. Wombell took no notice of the communication; hence the action. Mr. Leech, solicitor, for plaintiff, on behalf of defendant, interrupted the plaintiff by telling his honor that it was the custom of the profession to copy each other's news; and even if it were not so, the report, after it had appeared in the Nottingham Daily Express, was now in the hands of the correspondent, but of the proprietor. He should prove the custom carried out by all newspapers in the kingdom by the evidence of the following gentlemen, whom he had subpoenaed:—Mr. Barton, editor of the Ilkeston Free Press; Mr. E. J. under the following circumstances:—Some time ago plaintiff engaged with the proprietors of the Nottingham Daily Express to supply them with the reports of the Alfreton Petty Sessions and the district news. Defendant copied these reports into his paper; and plaintiff wrote a letter saying if this were continued he should expect an allowance of 10s. per week, and that he now demanded £2 for what had been already copied. Mr. Wombell took no notice of the communication; hence the action. Mr. Leech, solicitor, for plaintiff, on behalf of defendant, interrupted the plaintiff by telling his honor that it was the custom of the profession to copy each other's news; and even if it were not so, the report, after it had appeared in the Nottingham Daily Express, was now in the hands of the correspondent, but of the proprietor. He should prove the custom carried out by all newspapers in the kingdom by the evidence of the following gentlemen, whom he had subpoenaed:—Mr. Barton, editor of the Ilkeston Free Press; Mr. E. J. under the following circumstances:—Some time ago plaintiff engaged with the proprietors of the Nottingham Daily Express to supply them with the reports of the Alfreton Petty Sessions and the district news. Defendant copied these reports into his paper; and plaintiff wrote a letter saying if this were continued he should expect an allowance of 10s. per week, and that he now demanded £2 for what had been already copied. Mr. Wombell took no notice of the communication; hence the action. Mr. Leech, solicitor, for plaintiff, on behalf of defendant, interrupted the plaintiff by telling his honor that it was the custom of the profession to copy each other's news; and even if it were not so, the report, after it had appeared in the Nottingham Daily Express, was now in the hands of the correspondent, but of the proprietor. He should prove the custom carried out by all newspapers in the kingdom by the evidence of the following gentlemen, whom he had subpoenaed:—Mr. Barton, editor of the Ilkeston Free Press; Mr. E. J. under the following circumstances:—Some time ago plaintiff engaged with the proprietors of the Nottingham Daily Express to supply them with the reports of the Alfreton Petty Sessions and the district news. Defendant copied these reports into his paper; and plaintiff wrote a letter saying if this were continued he should expect an allowance of 10s. per week, and that he now demanded £2 for what had been already copied. Mr. Wombell took no notice of the communication; hence the action. Mr. Leech, solicitor, for plaintiff, on behalf of defendant, interrupted the plaintiff by telling his honor that it was the custom of the profession to copy each other's news; and even if it were not so, the report, after it had appeared in the Nottingham Daily Express, was now in the hands of the correspondent, but of the proprietor. He should prove the custom carried out by all newspapers in the kingdom by the evidence of the following gentlemen, whom he had subpoenaed:—Mr. Barton, editor of the Ilkeston Free Press; Mr. E. J. under the following circumstances:—Some time ago plaintiff engaged with the proprietors of the Nottingham Daily Express to supply them with the reports of the Alfreton Petty Sessions and the district news. Defendant copied these reports into his paper; and plaintiff wrote a letter saying if this were continued he should expect an allowance of 10s. per week, and that he now demanded £2 for what had been already copied. Mr. Wombell took no notice of the communication; hence the action. Mr. Leech, solicitor, for plaintiff, on behalf of defendant, interrupted the plaintiff by telling his honor that it was the custom of the profession to copy each other's news; and even if it were not so, the report, after it had appeared in the Nottingham Daily Express, was now in the hands of the correspondent, but of the proprietor. He should prove the custom carried out by all newspapers in the kingdom by the evidence of the following gentlemen, whom he had subpoenaed:—Mr. Barton, editor of the Ilkeston Free Press; Mr. E. J. under the following circumstances:—Some time ago plaintiff engaged with the proprietors of the Nottingham Daily Express to supply them with the reports of the Alfreton Petty Sessions and the district news. Defendant copied these reports into his paper; and plaintiff wrote a letter saying if this were continued he should expect an allowance of 10s. per week, and that he now demanded £2 for what had been already copied. Mr. Wombell took no notice of the communication; hence the action. Mr. Leech, solicitor, for plaintiff, on behalf of defendant, interrupted the plaintiff by telling his honor that it was the custom of the profession to copy each other's news; and even if it were not so, the report, after it had appeared in the Nottingham Daily Express, was now in the hands of the correspondent, but of the proprietor. He should prove the custom carried out by all newspapers in the kingdom by the evidence of the following gentlemen, whom he had subpoenaed:—Mr. Barton, editor of the Ilkeston Free Press; Mr. E. J. under the following circumstances:—Some time ago plaintiff engaged with the proprietors of the Nottingham Daily Express to supply them with the reports of the Alfreton Petty Sessions and the district news. Defendant copied these reports into his paper; and plaintiff wrote a letter saying if this were continued he should expect an allowance of 10s. per week, and that he now demanded £2 for what had been already copied. Mr. Wombell took no notice of the communication; hence the action. Mr. Leech, solicitor, for plaintiff, on behalf of defendant, interrupted the plaintiff by telling his honor that it was the custom of the profession to copy each other's news; and even if it were not so, the report, after it had appeared in the Nottingham Daily Express, was now in the hands of the correspondent, but of the proprietor. He should prove the custom carried out by all newspapers in the kingdom by the evidence of the following gentlemen, whom he had subpoenaed:—Mr. Barton, editor of the Ilkeston Free Press; Mr. E. J. under the following circumstances:—Some time ago plaintiff engaged with the proprietors of the Nottingham Daily Express to supply them with the reports of the Alfreton Petty Sessions and the district news. Defendant copied these reports into his paper; and plaintiff wrote a letter saying if this were continued he should expect an allowance of 10s. per week, and that he now demanded £2 for what had been already copied. Mr. Wombell took no notice of the communication; hence the action. Mr. Leech, solicitor, for plaintiff, on behalf of defendant, interrupted the plaintiff by telling his honor that it was the custom of the profession to copy each other's news; and even if it were not so, the report, after it had appeared in the Nottingham Daily Express, was now in the hands of the correspondent, but of the proprietor. He should prove the custom carried out by all newspapers in the kingdom by the evidence of the following gentlemen, whom he had subpoenaed:—Mr. Barton, editor of the Ilkeston Free Press; Mr. E. J. under the following circumstances:—Some time ago plaintiff engaged with the proprietors of the Nottingham Daily Express to supply them with the reports of the Alfreton Petty Sessions and the district news. Defendant copied these reports into his paper; and plaintiff wrote a letter saying if this were continued he should expect an allowance of 10s. per week, and that he now demanded £2 for what had been already copied. Mr. Wombell took no notice of the communication; hence the action. Mr. Leech, solicitor, for plaintiff, on behalf of defendant, interrupted the plaintiff by telling his honor that it was the custom of the profession to copy each other's news; and even if it were not so, the report, after it had appeared in the Nottingham Daily Express, was now in the hands of the correspondent, but of the proprietor. He should prove the custom carried out by all newspapers in the kingdom by the evidence of the following gentlemen, whom he had subpoenaed:—Mr. Barton, editor of the Ilkeston Free Press; Mr. E. J. under the following circumstances:—Some time ago plaintiff engaged with the proprietors of the Nottingham Daily Express to supply them with the reports of the Alfreton Petty Sessions and the district news. Defendant copied these reports into his paper; and plaintiff wrote a letter saying if this were continued he should expect an allowance of 10s. per week, and that he now demanded £2 for what had been already copied. Mr. Wombell took no notice of the communication; hence the action. Mr. Leech, solicitor, for plaintiff, on behalf of defendant, interrupted the plaintiff by telling his honor that it was the custom of the profession to copy each other's news; and even if it were not so, the report, after it had appeared in the Nottingham Daily Express, was now in the hands of the correspondent, but of the proprietor. He should prove the custom carried out by all newspapers in the kingdom by the evidence of the following gentlemen, whom he had subpoenaed:—Mr. Barton, editor of the Ilkeston Free Press; Mr. E. J. under the following circumstances:—Some time ago plaintiff engaged with the proprietors of the Nottingham Daily Express to supply them with the reports of the Alfreton Petty Sessions and the district news. Defendant copied these reports into his paper; and plaintiff wrote a letter saying if this were continued he should expect an allowance of 10s. per week, and that he now demanded £2 for what had been already copied. Mr. Wombell took no notice of the communication; hence the action. Mr. Leech, solicitor, for plaintiff, on behalf of defendant, interrupted the plaintiff by telling his honor that it was the custom of the profession to copy each other's news; and even if it were not so, the report, after it had appeared in the Nottingham Daily Express, was now in the hands of the correspondent, but of the proprietor. He should prove the custom carried out by all newspapers in the kingdom by the evidence of the following gentlemen, whom he had subpoenaed:—Mr. Barton, editor of the Ilkeston Free Press; Mr. E. J. under the following circumstances:—Some time ago plaintiff engaged with the proprietors of the Nottingham Daily Express to supply them with the reports of the Alfreton Petty Sessions and the district news. Defendant copied these reports into his paper; and plaintiff wrote a letter saying if this were continued he should expect an allowance of 10s. per week, and that he now demanded £2 for what had been already copied. Mr. Wombell took no notice of the communication; hence the action. Mr. Leech, solicitor, for plaintiff, on behalf of defendant, interrupted the plaintiff by telling his honor that it was the custom of the profession to copy each other's news; and even if it were not so, the report, after it had appeared in the Nottingham Daily Express, was now in the hands of the correspondent, but of the proprietor. He should prove the custom carried out by all newspapers in the kingdom by the evidence of the following gentlemen, whom he had subpoenaed:—Mr. Barton, editor of the Ilkeston Free Press; Mr. E. J. under the following circumstances:—Some time ago plaintiff engaged with the proprietors of the Nottingham Daily Express to supply them with the reports of the Alfreton Petty Sessions and the district news. Defendant copied these reports into his paper; and plaintiff wrote a letter saying if this were continued he should expect an allowance of 10s. per week, and that he now demanded £2 for what had been already copied. Mr. Wombell took no notice of the communication; hence the action. Mr. Leech, solicitor, for plaintiff, on behalf of defendant, interrupted the plaintiff by telling his honor that it was the custom of the profession to copy each other's news; and even if it were not so, the report, after it had appeared in the Nottingham Daily Express, was now in the hands of the correspondent, but of the proprietor. He should prove the custom carried out by all newspapers in the kingdom by the evidence of the following gentlemen, whom he had subpoenaed:—Mr. Barton, editor of the Ilkeston Free Press; Mr. E. J. under the following circumstances:—Some time ago plaintiff engaged with the proprietors of the Nottingham Daily Express to supply them with the reports of the Alfreton Petty Sessions and the district news. Defendant copied these reports into his paper; and plaintiff wrote a letter saying if this were continued he should expect an allowance of 10s. per week, and that he now demanded £2 for what had been already copied. Mr. Wombell took no notice of the communication; hence the action. Mr. Leech, solicitor, for plaintiff, on behalf of defendant, interrupted the plaintiff by telling his honor that it was the custom of the profession to copy each other's news; and even if it were not so, the report, after it had appeared in the Nottingham Daily Express, was now in the hands of the correspondent, but of the proprietor. He should prove the custom carried out by all newspapers in the kingdom by the evidence of the following gentlemen, whom he had subpoenaed:—Mr. Barton, editor of the Ilkeston Free Press; Mr. E. J. under the following circumstances:—Some time ago plaintiff engaged with the proprietors of the Nottingham Daily Express to supply them with the reports of the Alfreton Petty Sessions and the district news. Defendant copied these reports into his paper; and plaintiff wrote a letter saying if this were continued he should expect an allowance of 10s. per week, and that he now demanded £2 for what had been already copied. Mr. Wombell took no notice of the communication; hence the action. Mr. Leech, solicitor, for plaintiff, on behalf of defendant, interrupted the plaintiff by telling his honor that it was the custom of the profession to copy each other's news; and even if it were not so, the report, after it had appeared in the Nottingham Daily Express, was now in the hands of the correspondent, but of the proprietor. He should prove the custom carried out by all newspapers in the kingdom by the evidence of the following gentlemen, whom he had subpoenaed:—Mr. Barton, editor of the Ilkeston Free Press; Mr. E. J. under the following circumstances:—Some time ago plaintiff engaged with the proprietors of the Nottingham Daily Express to supply them with the reports of the Alfreton Petty Sessions and the district news. Defendant copied these reports into his paper; and plaintiff wrote a letter saying if this were continued he should expect an allowance of 10s. per week, and that he now demanded £2 for what had been already copied. Mr. Wombell took no notice of the communication; hence the action. Mr. Leech, solicitor, for plaintiff, on behalf of defendant, interrupted the plaintiff by telling his honor that it was the custom of the profession to copy each other's news; and even if it were not so, the report, after it had appeared in the Nottingham Daily Express, was now in the hands of the correspondent, but of the proprietor. He should prove the custom carried out by all newspapers in the kingdom by the evidence of the following gentlemen, whom he had subpoenaed:—Mr. Barton, editor of the Ilkeston Free Press; Mr.